

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                          | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/767,669                               | 01/29/2004  | Heinrich Lang        | LMX-129 CON         | 5424             |  |
| 7590 09/28/200'<br>McNair Law Firm, P.A. |             | •                    | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
| P.O. Box 1082                            | 7           |                      | SHAFER, RICKY D     |                  |  |
| Greenville, SC 29603-0827                |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| <del>,</del>                             |             |                      | 2872                |                  |  |
|  |             |                      |                     | ,                |  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|  |             |                      | 09/28/2007          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Advisory Action                      | 10/767,669      | ı |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner        | 7 |
|                                      | Ricky D. Shafer | ٠ |

|   | Application No. | Applicant(s) | ! |  |
|---|-----------------|--------------|---|--|
|   | 10/767,669      | LANG ET AL.  | , |  |
|   | Examiner        | Art Unit     |   |  |
| į | Ricky D. Shafer | 2872         |   |  |
|   |                 |              |   |  |

|   | 1  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief  | Examiner   | Art Unit  | -                                |  |  |  |
|   | Ricky D. Shafer  | 2872  |                                  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app  | ears on the cover sheet with the o   | orrespondence add   | ress                             |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>06 September 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE TH  | IIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION F   | OR ALLOWANCE.   | 1.                               |  |  |  |
| ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:  |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
|   | The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE MONTH OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN THE WAS FILED |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.   | ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of th                                     |                                  |  |  |  |
| AMENDMENTS  |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   | .,,  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.  |  | mpliant Amendment   | (PTOL-324).                      |  |  |  |
| 5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s   | •  | •   |                                  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   |  | timely filed amendme                                      | ent canceling the                |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro   |  | ll be entered and an e                                    | explanation of                   |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |  |   | ,                                |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  | •   |                                  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:  |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |   | ;                                |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good awas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | ut before or on the date of filing a N<br>nd sufficient reasons why the affida   | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u><br>vit or other evidence i | ot be entered<br>s necessary and |  |  |  |
| 7. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| 0. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| I1. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because See Continuation Sheet.   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| 2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |
| 13.  Other:   |  |   | 1                                |  |  |  |
|   | ·  |   | 1                                |  |  |  |
|   |  |   | *                                |  |  |  |
| •   |  | •   | :                                |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |                                  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons clearly set forth in the communication mailed on 08/24/2007. In that, the proposed amendment to claim 26, lines 10-11, filed on 07/30/2007, raise new issues in regards to the language "a plurality of connectors engaged with each of said positioning apparatus, said framing and said bracket, said connectors securing" which would require further consideration and/or search. In addition, the proposed amendment to claim 26 at lines 10-11, filed on 7/30/2007, changes the scope of the finally rejected claims 26-35, by introducing newly presented structural limitations that were not previously claimed and considered and/or searched, which clearly does not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplying the issue for appeal. Applicant should be advised that, applicant cannot, as matter of right, amend any finally rejected claims, see MPEP 714.13, whether applicant proclaims he/she is attempting to clarify the claim language to overcome certain objections/rejections. In fact, the only exception is where an amendment after final rejection merely cancels claims, adopts examiner suggestions, removes issues for appeal (i.e., amendments which do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search), or in some other way requires only a cursory review by the examiner (i.e., amendments which do not raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search). Note MPEP 714.13. In this particular case, the amendment filed on 07/30/2007 will not be entered due that to the fact that the proposed amendment to claim 26 at lines 10-11, raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and presents newly added structural limitations that were not previously claimed and considered and/or searched, which changes the scope of the finally rejected claims 26-35, which clearly does not place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplying the issues for appeal.

> RICKYLD. SHAFTER PATENT EXAMINED ART UNIT 200 7572